

From: Aycock, Mary [<mailto:Aycock.Mary@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 9:54 AM
To: Nicole Fyffe
Cc: Jeff.Biggs@tucsonaz.gov
Subject: Re: Tucson International Airport Superfund Area A public comment

Yes it would take a major revision to the Consent Decree. We will officially respond to all of the comments when the public comment period closes on May 21. Thank you for your comments as they will be considered by the agencies. MTA

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 25, 2017, at 9:47 AM, Nicole Fyffe [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks Mary. At the time (1988) that probably made sense. But its now 2017 and TW has developed a fantastic CAP recharge system, so we no longer need it as another source of drinking water. Looks like the plant is a 1/2 mile from the reclaimed system. TW is also looking at putting water in the Santa Cruz downtown to green up the river. Both of these options seem better than drinking it. I totally understand it meets the water quality requirements today. My concern is the water quality requirements of tomorrow.

If I understand you and Jeff correctly, it would require an action by the courts to change the ROD/Concent decree so that the water could be put to non-drinking water uses? Thanks. I really do appreciate your time on this.

-Nicole

From: "Aycock, Mary" <Aycock.Mary@epa.gov>
To: Nicole Fyffe [REDACTED]
Cc: "Chad.Lapora@tucsonaz.gov" <Chad.Lapora@tucsonaz.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 8:58 AM
Subject: Re: Tucson International Airport Superfund Area A public comment

The original ROD called for the water to be used for drinking water which was needed at the time (1988) so it was a legal requirement set forth by the first ROD. Again, all of this water meets the requirements of the Clean Water Act and is non- detect for chemicals and safe to drink.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 25, 2017, at 8:29 AM, Nicole Fyffe [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks Mary.

Jeff and Chad, Sandy already explained to me that the water delivered to my house is about 60% of this treated water and 40% recharged water from Avra Valley. Its the requirement that treated water be used for drinking water, instead of some other beneficial use, that is frustrating to me. I was trying to better understand whether the key constraint to putting it to some other beneficial use was the legal requirement (ROD), or cost of capital improvements, or both. I can wait for more information from Mary on May 21, if this question is better suited to her responsibilities.

Thanks.

-Nicole

From: "Aycock, Mary" <Aycock.Mary@epa.gov>
To: Nicole Fyffe [REDACTED]
Cc: "Jeff.Biggs@tucsonaz.gov" <Jeff.Biggs@tucsonaz.gov>; "chad.lapora@tucsonaz.gov" <chad.lapora@tucsonaz.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2017 10:16 AM
Subject: RE: Tucson International Airport Superfund Area A public comment

Dear Ms. Fyffe:

We will respond to your questions during the responsiveness summary period which will be May 21, 2017. In the meantime, please address questions regarding your water distribution center to the City of Tucson by way of Jeff Biggs and Chad Lapora who are copied here above. Note that City of Tucson water meets all of the criteria established under the Clean Water Act and the City can provide you with a list of the tests that they perform on their drinking water. I do not have information on where exactly your water is coming from, so you will need to contact City of Tucson.

The original Record of Decision called for the treated water to be used for drinking water under the beneficial reuse clause. I will have more information on this by May 21, 2017. Thank you for your comments.

Mary T. Aycock
Remedial Project Manager
U.S EPA Region 9 (SFD 8-1)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Work: (415) 972-3289
Cell: (415) 444-6339
aycock.mary@epa.gov

From: Nicole Fyffe [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 4:45 PM
To: Aycock, Mary <Aycock.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: Tucson International Airport Superfund Area A public comment

Ms. Aycock, the past weekend I read 2 articles in the Arizona Daily Star on this issue. I had heard generally of the issue before, but had no idea that the treated water was being delivered to households in Tucson, one of which is mine. Until now, I thought my household's water came from the recharge facilities in Avra Valley, which is a combo of Colorado River Water and ground water. From the little I learned since this weekend, my understanding is that as part of some type of agreement or settlement, Tucson Water is required to put this treated water to "beneficial use", which they or someone determined to be the Tucson water distribution system. I do not understand why it could not be beneficially used by either reinjecting it into the ground water in that area or distributing it to industrial users (mines, etc) that would not be drinking it. I trust that the EPA and Tucson Water do believe the risks are low enough to serve us this

water. But, just like with the recent discovery of 1,4-dioxane, I can imagine that there is a likelihood that other contaminants may be discovered in this plume years from now. Why should we have to drink this water when there are plenty of other potential users for this water? Why couldn't Tucson water exchange this water for a share of CAP water being used by one of the mines and pump this water down to the mines? I'm guessing it has to do with infrastructure costs. Or why could Tucson Water not treat it like reclaimed water and only deliver it to parks and landscaped areas? These did not appear to be one of the alternatives that EPA evaluated, so I can't see what those alternatives would have cost. Were those alternatives considered early on, but dismissed?

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Hope you have time to respond to my questions.

Nicole Fyffe

